This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated April 13, 2010. Claims 9 to 11, 13 to 15, 17 and 18 are pending, of which Claims 9 and 13 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claims 9 to11 and 13 to15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,774,951 (Narushima). Applicants submit that independent Claims 9 and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the applied reference for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claims 9 and 13 relate to data broadcast reception and reproduction. A digital broadcast wave is received which is transmitted from a broadcasting station. Data broadcasting data included in the digital broadcasting wave is obtained. The data broadcasting data includes displayable content data and text data. The text data is described in print permission/inhibition information of the content data. The text data includes a print permission update script program executed based on a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcasting station. The script program is defined before and corresponding to the transmission of the broadcasting event command. The print permission/inhibition information indicates a set value for permission or inhibition of printing the content data. The text data is described by a markup language. The script program is included within the text data described in the markup language and is a function for executing a process to update the set value of the print permission/inhibition information. The data broadcasting data obtained is stored. The print permission/inhibition information of the content data is obtained, from the text data stored. The set value indicated by the print

8

permission/inhibition information is converted by being updated from one permitting the printing the content data into one inhibiting the printing the content data, or from one inhibiting the printing the content data into one permitting the printing the content data. During the conversion, a browser displays the content data by interpreting the text data, and the browser updates the set value indicated by the print permission/inhibition information corresponding to the content data obtained and stored, according to an execution of the script program corresponding to the broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave.

One feature of the independent claims is that text data, included in data broadcasting data in a digital broadcasting wave includes a print permission update script program executed based on a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from a broadcasting station. By virtue of this feature, a set value for permission or inhibition of printing content data can often be updated by executing the script program based on a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave. For example, the set value can be updated from one permitting the printing the content data into one inhibiting the printing the content data, or vice versa. As a result, of this arrangement, a script program that is defined before and corresponding to the transmission of the broadcasting event command can be typically used to remotely update limits on the printing of, for example, portions of a television broadcast which are subject to copyright protection.

Another feature of the independent claims is that the script program is included within the text data described in the markup language and is a function for executing a process to update the set value of the print permission/inhibition information.

By virtue of this feature the script program can be included with the text data that is

included with the data broadcasting data and can be included as a part of markup language

text data. For example, as shown in the embodiment in Fig. 4A, a portion of which is

shown annotated below, a script includes data arranged between a line marked "script

language = "JavaScript">" and a line marked by "</script>".

FIG. 4A

(1) XML SOURCE (XML DATA USED IN EMBODIMANT 1 (START UP SCREEN)

```
) EXAMPLE)
<!DOCTYPE dbc SYSTEM "http://www. xxx. co. jp/dbc. dtd">
<head>
<title> Music Program </title>
<script language = "JavaScript">                                    Script
function initialize () {
}
function enablePrint () {
    document. getElementById ("movie"). style. printability = true;        // (C)
}
function disablePrint () {
    document. getElementById ("movie"). style. printability = false;       // (D)
}
</script>
</head>
<bevent>
    <bitem type = "EventMessageFired" subscribe = "subscribe" message_id = "01"
on  occur = "enablePrint ()  ;/>         // (I)
    <bitem type = "EventMessageFired" subscribe = "subscribe" message_id = "02"
on  occur = "disablePrint ()  ;/>         // (J)
</bevent>
<body onLoad = "initialize () ">       // (A)
<div style = "left : 60px ; top : 40px ; width : 480px ; height : 270px ;">
    <object id = "movie"  style = "left : 0px ; top : 0px ; width : 480px
; height : 270px ; printability = false" data = "/-1" type = video/X-arib-mpeg2" remain
= "remain"/>         // (B)
```

It is believed that Narushima fails to disclose at least the features noted

above. The Office continues to assert that the HTML shown in Fig. 19 of Narushima is the

same as the script program referred to in the independent claims. Applicants respectfully

disagree for at least the following reason. In the independent claims the script program is

included within the text data described in the markup language, which makes clear the

difference between the script program and the markup language. In contrast, Fig. 19 of

10

Narushima corresponds to the markup language only, and does not apparently include anything that might correspond to a script program, much less a script program that is executed based on a broadcast event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcasting station.

The Office Action and the Examiner's Interview Summary appear to argue that the contents information conversion unit 68 teach the conversion referred to in Claims 9 and 13 and that a broadcast event command is included in a digital broadcasting wave transmitted from a broadcasting station shown in Fig. 8 of Narushima. Applicants note however, that according to Narushima, the only print permission or inhibition in Narushima appears to relate to commanding the printer to start printing. However, in Narushima a printer control signal to start printing originates with a user specifying an operational command input into a remote controller and does not include any update of a set value as a result of executing a script program included in a digital broadcasting wave that is executed based on a broadcast event command, that is also included in a digital broadcasting wave and that is also transmitted from the same broadcasting station. See, col. 14, lines 33 to 36, and col. 12, lines 29 to 33. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that any command to inhibit or permit printing in Narushima is based solely on a predetermined operation between the user's remote controller and the set top box (STB 30), which is not based at all on the execution of a script program that is included in a digital broadcast wave, and executing that script based on a broadcast event command that is also included in the digital broadcast wave transmitted from the same digital broadcast station as the script program.

For at least the foregoing reasons Applicants submit that independent Claims 9 and 13 are allowable over the applied art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention reconsideration, respectively, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christian Mannino/
Christian Mannino
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 58,373

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200